



COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Scoring Rubric

Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program
APPLICATION CONTENTS
For Title I and non-Title I Schools and Districts

I. Local Educational Agency Section

A. Cover Page

B. Description of LEA's Strategic Plan and CSRD **10 points**

C. LEA Identification of Schools To Be Served: including targeting of resources **30 points**
and supporting school reform

D. Description of Local Educational Agency's Support **30 points**

E. Local Educational Agency Evaluation **30 points**

F. Assurances

Local Education Agency Points **100 points**

II. School Application Section

- A. Cover Page**
- B. Abstract**
- C. Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program Description**

Component 1: Effective, Research-based Methods and Strategies 35 points

- Element 1: Theoretical or Research Foundation for the Program**
- Element 2: Evaluation-based Evidence of Effectiveness**
- Element 3: Implementation**
- Element 4: Replicability**

Component 2: Program Description 15 points

Component 3: Professional Development 5 points

Component 4: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks 10 points

Component 5: Support within the School 5 points

Component 6: Parental and Community Involvement 5 points

Component 7: External Technical Support and Assistance 5 points

Component 8: Evaluation Strategies 15 points

Component 9: Coordination of Services 5 points

Appendix

School(s) Points

100 points

I. Local Education Agency (LEA) Application: The LEA application must contain the following sections. The total possible points for each section are provided in parentheses.

A. COVER PAGE: Complete Forms 2a, 2b, and 2c included in this Request For Application.

B. DESCRIPTION OF LEA’S STRATEGIC PLAN AND CSRD (10 maximum points)

Describe how the goals and intent of CSRD are congruent with the LEA’s vision, mission and beliefs and how it increases student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. Explain how CSRD interfaces and is aligned with the District Strategic Plan or Local Improvement Plan and state reforms. Explain how CSRD responds to the identified district needs and strengths and is in alignment with the district goals for improving student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Description of LEA’s Strategic Plan and CSRD:

MOST RIGOROUS (10 - 8 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (7 – 4 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (3 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of the LEA’s plan for CSRD includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong alignment of CSRD with district’s vision, mission and beliefs to raise student achievement in reading/language arts and math. • Strong alignments among the CSRD program, the Local Improvement Plan, and/or Strategic Plan, and state reforms. • Strong connection between CSRD and the LEA’s needs and strengths identified in the local improvement plan or strategic plan. • A detailed description of the alignment between the goals and intent of CSRD and the goals of the LEA’s strategic plan or local improvement plan to improve student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. 	<p>Evidence of the LEA’s plan for CSRD includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some alignment of CSRD with the LEA’s vision, mission and beliefs to raise student achievement. • Some alignments among the CSRD program, the Local Improvement/Strategic Plan and state reforms. • A general connection between CSRD and LEA’s needs and strengths identified in the local improvement or strategic plan. • General description of the alignment between the goals of CSRD and the LEA’s goals for improving student achievement in reading, language arts and mathematics. 	<p>Evidence of the LEA’s plan for CSRD includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no alignment of CSRD with the LEA’s vision, mission and beliefs. • Little or no alignment among the CSRD program, Local Improvement/Strategic Plan and state reforms. • Little or no connection between CSRD to the identified district needs and strengths. • Little or no alignment between the goals of CSRD and district goals for improving student achievement.

C. IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

(30 maximum points)

Explain the LEA's criteria and process for ranking and selecting the schools to participate in the CSRD program. If applying for more than one school justify the order of priority based on: 1) the school's need for reform including the use of STAR results for the percentage of students not achieving California standards in reading/language arts and mathematics. Include other elements contained in California's Pubic School Performance Accountability Program. Additional factors may include, *but are not limited to, attendance, discipline referrals, retention rates, graduation rates, college entrance rates, suspensions, expulsions, dropout rates, course taking patterns, and parental involvement*; and, 2) the quality of the school's CSRD program based on an appropriate, effective, research-based school reform model that integrates the nine required components; the school's readiness to initiate school reform, and a proposed CSRD program design to achieve the school's objectives within a three-year period.

LEA Identification of Schools to be Served:

MOST RIGOROUS (30 – 25 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (24 – 10 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (9 – 0 points)
<p>The district selection criteria for CSRD participating schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed description of the LEA's criteria for ranking schools to participate in CSRD based on their need to improve student achievement. • A detailed description of the collaboration between the LEA and schools (e.g. representation of stakeholders, frequency of meetings, decision rules, and other information relevant to the collaboration). • A detailed description of the LEA's criteria to determine school readiness to improve student achievement such as, but not limited to, full stakeholder involvement in schoolwide decisions, staff knowledge of the continuous improvement model, strategies to achieve schoolwide consensus and commitment; integration of family and community resources and, a well defined program to achieve the school's objectives within the three-year CSRD program. • A detailed description of the LEA's process to select schools based on their readiness criteria. • A detailed description of the selection of schools based on the LEA's criteria to implement a high quality, well defined, research-based school reform model that integrates the nine required CSRD components. 	<p>The district selection criteria for CSRD participating schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general description of the LEA's criteria for ranking schools to participate in CSRD based on their need to improve student achievement. • A general description of the collaboration between the LEA and schools such as representation of stakeholders, frequency of meetings, decision rules, etc. • A general description of the LEA's criteria to determine school readiness to improve student achievement. • A general description of the LEA's process to select schools based on their readiness criteria. • General description about selecting schools in based on the LEA's criteria to implement a research-based school reform program that address the nine CSRD components. 	<p>The district selection criteria for CSRD participating schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited or no involvement between district and school in the school's selection process. Limited factors are presented that reflect student needs. • Little or no evidence of collaboration. • Limited or unclear description of LEA's criteria to determine school readiness to improve student achievement. • Limited or unclear description of the LEA's process to select schools based on readiness criteria. • Little evidence of school readiness to initiate the CSRD Program.

D. DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY'S SUPPORT

(30 maximum points)

Provide a LEA plan for technical assistance and support for the effective implementation of the CSRD programs selected by the schools. This plan may include helping schools in such areas as: 1) using available current needs assessment data including STAR results; 2) selecting a school reform model that matches the needs of their students and the capabilities of the faculty; 3) aligning the school's comprehensive reform program with the LEA and state goals for improving student achievement in reading/language arts and math; 4) assisting in the analyses of the site budget for potential adjustments to better leverage funds; 5) developing a school based information system that provides each school site with the data and ideas necessary to make good decisions on budget, curriculum, instruction and student achievement; 6) implementing California's Public School Performance Accountability Program; 7) coordinating district professional development and linkages to other relevant support providers; 8) implementing a public engagement process that involves families and the community members/agencies in planning, implementing, and evaluating the CSRD. The LEA's support includes the adoption of California's content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and other standards adopted by the State Board of Education as well as frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents. These standards, frameworks and initiatives must be incorporated as a central element in CSRD program. The description should delineate how the LEA's policies must facilitate implementation of the CSRD program at the school site.

Identify the federal, state, local, and private resources in the district plan for school support that are committed to implement and sustain the CSRD program. Include a plan for assisting schools with budget reallocation and leveraging strategies. Include a narrative justification that corresponds to the budget provided on Form 3 for the first year of the CSRD program. Include the amount of funds (up to 10 percent of the total amount), if any, requested for administration, technical assistance, and evaluation activities, and an explanation of how these funds will be used.

Description of LEA's Support

MOST RIGOROUS (30 – 25 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (24 – 10 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (9 – 0 points)
<p>The district's support to schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the LEA's role in collaboratively developing the CSRD with representatives from the LEA, schools, families, and community members/agencies. • Comprehensive technical assistance to the staff for the effective implementation of the CSRD program. <i>This may include working with schools to a) use available current needs assessment data in selecting a school reform model, b) align the school's goals with the district and state, c) refine school budgets, d) develop a school based information system, e) develop a district and school accountability systems, f) coordinate professional development, and g) develop a public engagement process.*</i> • A detailed description of California's content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as frameworks, reading and 	<p>The district's support to schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general description of the LEA's role in developing CSRD with representatives from the LEA, schools, families, community members and agencies. • Some technical assistance to the staff for effective implementation of CSRD. Some areas addressed include helping schools select a school reform model, developing a district and school accountability system, and coordinating professional development. • Partial description of California's standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and other standards adopted by the State Board of Education and partial incorporation 	<p>The district's support to schools includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unclear description of the LEA's role in developing CSRD with existing resources. • Limited technical assistance to the staff for implementation of CSRD. • No evidence of implementation of California's standards in reading/language arts and mathematics

<p>mathematics initiatives, and companion documents and the incorporation of the standards, frameworks, and initiatives as central elements in the CSRD program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A convincing description of ways that the LEA can facilitate the implementation of CSRD by removing barriers or streamlining operations <i>in such areas as personnel, district reporting requirements, union partnerships, instructional and curricular planning,, and family-community partnerships.*</i> • The LEA's identification and securing of resources from local, state, federal and private sources to support the school's CSRD model. Clear and practical approaches to assist school budget reallocations and strategies to leverage existing funds to ensure successful program implementation and continuation of school reform efforts. • A detailed budget breakdown by category of the LEA's use of the 10% of CSRD funds accompanied by a convincing justification of how it supports the school's implementation of school wide reform. <p>(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)</p>	<p>of standards, frameworks, and initiatives as part of the CSRD program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general description of the LEA's efforts to support the school sites selected to implement CSRD by facilitating policy and procedural processes. • Some LEA's identification of resources from some sources to support the school's CSRD model. Some approaches to assist the school budget reallocations to leverage existing funds for program implementation. • A general budget breakdown by category of the LEA's use of the 10 percent of CSRD funds accompanied by a general justification of how it supports the school's implementation of schoolwide reform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited description of the LEA's efforts to support the school sites selected to implement CSRD by presenting policy and procedural processes. • Limited identification of resources to support the school's CSRD model and limited approaches to reallocate and leverage funds. • An incomplete budget breakdown by category of the LEA's use of the 10 percent of CSRD funds with little or no justification of how it supports the school's implementation of schoolwide reform.
---	--	---

E. LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY EVALUATION for Title I and Non-Title I schools and districts

(30 maximum points)

1. BASIC REQUIREMENTS

The LEA program evaluation plan must provide an assessment of the 1) implementation of the CSRD model, and 2) results on student achievement and 3) other indicators of school performance. Evaluation measures that respond to the linguistic and cultural needs of the students and other CSRD participants must be included. Discussion should indicate how the LEA will build on existing LEA procedures to collect, analyze, and report data pertinent to CSRD implementation and impact. The plan must address the involvement and participation of families, community agencies, and all levels of school staff in the evaluation process.

The plan must include strategies for using program evaluation results to improve implementation and impact of the CSRD model at each school site throughout the three-year period of CSRD funding. LEAs must submit continuation proposals for years two and three for each CSRD school. Proposals must include data that show progress toward meeting the previous year's goals and benchmarks that are described in the LEA and school evaluation designs and that are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program. Goals and benchmarks must address student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and model implementation. The Department will monitor individual school progress through its statewide evaluation and make annual determinations as to whether schools qualify to receive continuation grants for years two and three.

Specifically the evaluation plan must identify measurable goals, benchmarks, and indicators to be assessed on a regular basis for:

- **student achievement**, particularly in reading/language arts and mathematics;
- **other indicators of school performance**, *such as discipline referrals, grade promotions and retentions, attendance, suspensions, expulsions, course taking patterns, graduation and college-going rates, family and community involvement, and stakeholder satisfaction; and*
- **CSRD model implementation** *in such areas as stakeholder support, parent participation, continuous professional development, fidelity and progress in implementing the CSRD model selected, continuous and flexible technical support by model providers and replicability.* *

The plan must include baseline and subsequent years' data for the preceding areas. It must demonstrate collaboration between the LEA and each CSRD school indicating which tasks will be the schools' and which will be the LEA's responsibility. It must also indicate how the LEA will evaluate the overall implementation of the CSRD models in the schools and measure the overall impact on student achievement and other indicators of school performance.

Furthermore, the LEA program evaluation plan must align with the following:

- school application(s) – components 4 (measurable goals and benchmarks) and 8 (program evaluation strategies);
- California's content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as state frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents;
- Department's statewide program evaluation of CSRD; and
- California's Public School Performance Accountability Program.

The plan must describe how the LEA will assist each CSRD school in data collection and analysis related to component 4 and in the development and implementation of strategies for component 8 of the school application. The LEA program evaluation plan must discuss how student assessment measures are aligned with California's content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as state frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents. The plan must include two or more measures, one of which must be the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program test (SAT-9), that are used to assess student progress and achievement. The plan must indicate how the information gained is used for assessing students' needs and performance. The LEA program evaluation plan must indicate how the LEA will participate in the Department's statewide program evaluation of CSRD. Further, the evaluation plan must be based on the LEA's adoption of the California content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and other standards adopted by the SBE.

(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Student Achievement Data. The program evaluation should rely on the same student assessments that are being used to assess all students against challenging State Standards and are serving as the assessments for the state's accountability system. (See the Department's enclosed memo of April 15, 1998, which requires the use of the statewide assessment, Student Testing and Reporting [STAR] and Augmented STAR.) Student achievement measures should also be related to the intended outcomes of the CSRD model to be implemented and to the needs of the students based on previous data.

The LEA program evaluation plan must include the information presented on pages 33 and 34 of the Consolidated Application, Part II. Non-Title I schools must also complete the information requested on pages 33 and 34. The plan must describe the process the LEA used to determine the rigor of its standards in reading/language arts and mathematics as well as the specific cutpoints for student achievement of these standards.

School Performance Data. School performance measures should be related to the intended outcomes of the CSRD models to be implemented and the needs of the CSRD schools based on previous data. Describe the selection of school performance indicators to be used and how the desired success rate for each of the selected school performance indicators was determined.

Model Implementation Data. LEAs must assist the schools to ensure fidelity to the design of the CSRD models as they are being implemented. The LEA's evaluation plan should include procedures for reporting the progress of model implementation at the CSRD school sites, especially for years two and three. The plan must explain the LEA's requirements for model providers will assist the schools and how the LEA will monitor compliance with those requirements.

CSRD Statewide Program Evaluation. To align local evaluation plans with the Department's statewide plan, LEAs should consider the following information.

- a. In the first year, Department efforts will concentrate on collecting and analyzing disaggregated baseline data from each school. In the second and third years, the statewide evaluation will shift to documenting model implementation and to assessing changes occurring in the schools, with an emphasis on student achievement and other indicators of school performance.
- b. The Department will work with LEAs to monitor the extent of CSRD model implementation and impact. LEAs will be asked, as part of the statewide evaluation, to provide information about the nature and extent to which schools receive external technical assistance in implementing their respective CSRD programs, the sources of the technical assistance, and the perception of its usefulness in furthering the implementation and impact of the program.
- c. Results of the evaluation will be used to improve programs in schools with weak results and disseminate the successes of schools with strong results, and to determine continued CSRD funding to participating schools for years two and three.

Local Education Agency Evaluation

<p>MOST RIGOROUS (30 – 25 points)</p>	<p>SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (24 – 10 points)</p>	<p>NOT RIGOROUS (9 – 0 points)</p>
<p>The district's program evaluation plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive and detailed plan for evaluating a) the overall implementation of the CSRD models and b) their overall impact on student achievement and other indicators of school performance. • Evaluation measures that are appropriate and fully responsive to the linguistic and cultural needs of the students and other CSRD participants. • Clear indication of how the LEA is building on existing procedures to collect, analyze and report data, including frequency of data collection and the parties responsible. • Strong evidence of involvement and participation of families, community agencies, and all levels of school staff in the evaluation process. • Thorough explanation of how the LEA will work with schools to interpret and utilize program evaluation results to improve implementation and impact of the CSRD model at each school site throughout the three-year period. • Thorough explanation of the collaboration of the LEA and each CSRD school with specified responsibilities in the development and implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation plan. • Clearly specified LEA goals, benchmarks, and assessment indicators for student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and CSRD model implementation. • Thorough data collection that includes baseline and subsequent years' results to measure progress and attainment of goals and benchmarks. 	<p>The district's program evaluation plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general program evaluation plan for a) the implementation of the CSRD models and b) their impact on the students' achievement and school performance. • Evaluation measures that are somewhat responsive to the linguistic and cultural needs of the students and other participants. • Some indication of how the LEA is building on existing procedures to collect, analyze and report data, including frequency of data collection and parties responsible. • Some evidence of involvement and participation of families, community agencies, and all levels of school staff in the evaluation process. • Some explanation of how the LEA will work with schools to interpret and utilize program evaluation results to improve implementation and impact of the CSRD model at each school site throughout the three-year period. • Some explanation of the collaboration of the LEA and each CSRD school with specified responsibilities in the development and implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation plan. • Generally stated LEA goals, benchmarks, and assessment indicators for student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and CSRD model implementation. • Some data collection that includes baseline and subsequent years' results to measure progress and attainment of goals and benchmarks. 	<p>The district's program evaluation plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A partial program evaluation plan for a) the implementation of the CSRD models and b) their impact on the students' achievement and school performance. • Evaluation measures that are minimally responsive to the linguistic and cultural needs of the students and other participants. • Limited indication of how the LEA is building on existing procedures to collect, analyze and report data. • Limited evidence of involvement and participation of families, community agencies, and all levels of school staff in the evaluation process. • Limited explanation of how the LEA will work with schools to interpret and utilize program evaluation results. • Limited explanation of the collaboration of the LEA and each CSRD school to develop and implement a comprehensive program evaluation plan. • Few or unclear LEA goals, benchmarks, and assessment indicators for student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and CSRD model implementation. • Limited data collection.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and thorough alignment of the district evaluation and components 4 and 8 of each school's application. • Complete and thorough description of the use of California's standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and of at least two or more corresponding student assessment measures, one of which must be the STAR test. • A thorough explanation of LEA's requirements for and monitoring of model providers. • Thorough explanation of how the LEA's program evaluation plan and procedures link with the Department's statewide program evaluation of CSRD and are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some alignment of the district evaluation and Components 4 and 8 of the school application. • General description of the use of California's standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and of two corresponding student assessment measures, one of which must be the STAR test. • A general explanation of LEA's requirements for and monitoring of model providers. • Some explanation of how the LEA's program evaluation plan and procedures link with the Department's statewide program evaluation of CSRD and are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear alignment of the district evaluation and Components 4 and 8 of the school application. • Limited description of the alignment of the use of California's standards in reading-language and mathematics with a single measure of student assessment. • Limited explanation of LEA's requirements for and monitoring of model providers. • Partial explanation of how the LEA's program evaluation plan and procedures link with the Department's statewide program evaluation of CSRD and are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program.
---	--	---

III. Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program Description: School Application Section

Component 1: EFFECTIVE, RESEARCH-BASED METHODS AND STRATEGIES:

(35 maximum points)

The proposed model includes innovative strategies and proven methods for student learning, teaching, and school management; is based on reliable research and effective practices; and has been successfully replicated in schools with diverse characteristics. The selection of the proposed model shows evidence of a thorough and thoughtful examination of externally or locally developed comprehensive school reform models and strategies. Describe how the CSRD program is adapted to the unique needs of the students and the school community to support the attainment of the California state content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as state frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents. Applicants should work closely with service providers of the model selected to complete this section.

Element 1: Theoretical or Research-Based Foundation for the Model

Explain the theory behind the model's design, including references to the research literature that describe why the model improves student achievement.

Component 1: ELEMENT 1: Theoretical or Research Foundation for the Program

MOST RIGOROUS (9 – 7 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (6 – 3 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (2 - 0 points)
Evidence of theoretical or research-based foundation for the model includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A comprehensive and detailed explanation of the theory behind the design for each model selected.• A description of multiple references to a broad base of research literature that strongly supports why the model improves student achievement.	Evidence of theoretical or research-based foundation for the model includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The theory behind the model design and explains how the model's components reinforce one another to improve student achievement.• Limited review of research.	Evidence of theoretical or research-based foundation for the model includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An unclear explanation of the theory behind the model design.• No research literature cited.

Element 2: Evaluation-Based Evidence of Effectiveness

Provide evidence of the model's evaluation-based effectiveness *such as student achievement gains using experimental and control groups through large-scale random assignment or carefully matched comparison groups; educationally significant pre and post achievement gains reliably measured; and student achievement gains that have been sustained for three or more years and have been confirmed through independent, third-party evaluation.**

Component 1: ELEMENT 2: Evaluation-Based Evidence of Effectiveness.

MOST RIGOROUS (9 – 7 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (6 – 3 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (2 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of evaluation-based effectiveness includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from a control group design in which the experimental group shows significant student achievement gains. These groups were part of a thorough, large-scale district-wide or national random assignment or carefully matched comparison groups. Significant student achievement gains sustained for three or more years. Confirmed evaluation through a comprehensive and valid independent third-party. 	<p>Evidence of evaluation-based effectiveness includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from reliable and valid assessments in a pre-post design produced educationally significant student achievement gains. Student achievement gains sustained for one or two years. Evaluation by a state, district, or school evaluation team. 	<p>Evidence of evaluation-based effectiveness includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student achievement gains shown for a single school. No student achievement gains sustained over time. A model that has been evaluated by its developers.

(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)

Element 3: Implementation

Explain how the model has been fully implemented in multiple sites for more than three years. Describe the specified implementation requirements and procedures such as staff development, curriculum instructional methods, materials, assessments, and costs. The cost of full implementation clearly specify costs of materials, staff development, and additional personnel in the model's purchase price. The model has been implemented in schools with characteristics similar to the target school such as same grade level, similar size, similar poverty levels, and similar student demographics (racial, ethnic, language composition) and similar student academic achievement.

Component 1: ELEMENT 3: Implementation

MOST RIGOROUS (9 – 7 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (6 – 3 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (2 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of effective implementation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful implementation in multiple sites for more than three years. • Detailed information and documentation that clearly specifies the model implementation requirements and procedures <i>such as, but not limited to: staff development, curriculum, instructional methods, materials, assessments, costs, and parent and community involvement.*</i> • Clearly specified and detailed explanations of the model's purchase price for the costs of materials, staff development, additional personnel, and other areas in order to fully and successfully implement the model. • Full and successful implementation in schools with characteristics similar to the target school. Similar characteristics <i>include, but are not limited to, same grade levels, similar size, similar poverty levels, and similar student demographics such as racial, ethnic, language minority composition, and similar student academic achievement.*</i> <p>(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)</p>	<p>Evidence of implementation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation in the original site(s) for more than three years. • Some documentation available that attempts to describe the implementation requirements of the model including staff development, curriculum, instruction methods, materials, and assessments. • General explanation of the model's purchase price for the costs of materials, staff development, and additional personnel and other areas in order to implement the model. • Successful implementation in at least one school with regarding characteristics similar to the target school. Similar characteristics include grade level, size, poverty levels, student demographics such as racial, ethnic, language minority composition and similar student academic achievement. 	<p>Evidence of implementation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the model in the original pilot site(s) for a minimum of one school year. • Limited documentation available that provides an unclear and general description of the program's requirements. • Limited documentation that provides general information about the model's costs. • Limited information on grade level, size, student demographics, poverty level, racial, ethnic and language minority concentration for schools where the model has been implemented.

Element 4: Replicability

Explain how the model has been replicated successfully with fidelity in a wide range of schools and districts (e.g. urban, rural, suburban and in appropriate grade spans). These replication sites have been evaluated, demonstrating significant student achievement gains comparable to those achieved in the pilot sites.

COMPONENT 1: ELEMENT 4: Replicability

MOST RIGOROUS (8 – 7 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (6 – 3 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (2 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of replicability includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and successful replication of the model in a wide range of schools and districts <i>such as urban, rural, and suburban and appropriate grade spans.*</i> • Detailed information and documentation that clearly specifies the model implementation requirements and procedures <i>such as, but not limited to staff development, curriculum, instructional methods, materials, assessments, costs, and parent community involvement.*</i> • Careful review and evaluation of replication sites, demonstrating significant student achievement gains comparable to those achieved in the pilot site(s). <p>(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)</p>	<p>Evidence of replicability includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replication of the model in a number of schools or districts representing some diverse settings. • Some documentation available that attempts to describe the implementation requirements of the model including staff development, curriculum, instruction methods, materials, and assessments. • General evaluation of some replication sites that demonstrate positive gains in student achievement. 	<p>Evidence of replicability includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evidence that the model has been initiated in several schools. • Limited documentation available that provides an unclear and general description of the program's requirements. • Initial results are available from the replication sites.

COMPONENT 2: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

(15 maximum points)

Describe how the selected model will be implemented within the context of a comprehensive design for effective school reform. Explain how this comprehensive school design aligns the school's curriculum, technology, resources and professional development into a school wide reform plan. The plan must be designed to enable all students—including students who are: performing below grade level, living in poverty, linguistically and culturally diverse, American Indian, migrant, neglected by their families, in the criminal justice system, affected by violence or substance abuse, homeless, and with disabilities—to meet California content standards, especially for reading/language arts and mathematics. In addition, note how the effort addresses the needs of all participants, including parents and staff, as identified in a comprehensive needs assessment.

COMPONENT 2: Program Description

MOST RIGOROUS (15 – 11 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (10 – 4 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (3 – 0 points)
<p>The school's program description includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive design that details how the model will be implemented for effective school functioning including instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management. The selected model is clearly aligned with the school curriculum, technology, resources and professional development programs for comprehensive schoolwide reform. • Ample evidence that the comprehensive design will enable all students, including students with special needs, to meet and California content standards, especially reading/language arts and mathematics, adopted by the SBE. • A plan that is clearly based on student achievement data for all students and include the needs of parents and staff, as identified in a comprehensive needs assessment. A detailed examination of student achievement data is tied to the selection of the model. • A comprehensive design that includes the demographic data of the school and fully responds to the cultural, linguistic and academic needs of all students. • A detailed description for the first year implementation plan and a general overview for the second and third years. 	<p>The school's program description includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general design about how the model implementation impacts school functioning including instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management. General alignment of the selected model with the school curriculum, technology, and professional development into schoolwide reform. • Some evidence that the plan will enable students with special needs to meet and California content standards for reading-language arts and mathematics. • A plan that is generally based on student achievement data of all students and include the needs of parents and staff. The needs assessment has included some examination of student achievement data to the selection of the model. • A general reflection of the demographics of the school which generally responds to the cultural, linguistic and academic needs of students. • A general description for the first year implementation plan and partial overview for the second and third years. 	<p>The school's program description includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A partial description of the model implementation with little or no reference to impact on total school functioning. The selected model partially aligns the school curriculum, technology, and professional development into a schoolwide plan. • Limited evidence that the plan will enable students to meet California content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics. • A plan partially based on the needs of all participants, including parents and staff. The comprehensive needs assessment has included a limited examination of student achievement data. • A partial reflection of the demographics of the school and responds to the needs of some of the students. • A partial description is provided for the first year implementation plan with no overview for the second and third years.

COMPONENT 3: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(5 maximum points)

Describe the professional development plan that is intended to improve instruction.

COMPONENT 3: Professional Development

MOST RIGOROUS (5 – 4 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (3 – 2 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (1 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of professional development includes a plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly focuses on identified student needs in reading/language arts and math. Fully aligns to the comprehensive school reform program and the selected models and includes a proposed timeline. Clearly aligns with California content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as state frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents and is tied directly to what teachers do in the classroom. Clearly promotes high quality, in-depth, and continuous teacher and staff, professional development. Allocates ample time for educators to reflect, analyze, collaborate and refine their professional practices. Clearly identifies administration participation, support, and follow-up and uses existing staff development resources and days for CSRD professional development activities. Clearly focuses on building site capacity to sustain reform. Provides for multiple learning opportunities <i>including, but not limited to, coaching; analysis of portfolios; examination of student work; and membership in peer support groups.*</i> 	<p>Evidence of professional development includes a plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is generally focused on identified student needs in reading/language arts and math. Is generally aligned to the comprehensive school reform program and the selected models and includes a proposed timeline. Generally aligns with California content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and other standards adopted by the SBE as well as state frameworks, reading and mathematics initiatives, and companion documents and is tied directly to what teachers do in the classroom.. Generally promotes some quality, in-depth and on-going teacher and staff professional development. Allocates some time for educators to reflect, analyze, and refine their professional practices. Generally identifies administration participation, support, and follow-up and uses staff development resources and days for CSRD professional development activities. Contains some focus on building site capacity to sustain reform. Provides for limited some learning opportunities <i>including, but not limited to, coaching; analysis of portfolios; examination of student work; and membership in peer support groups.*</i> 	<p>Evidence of professional development includes a plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is based on incomplete identification of student needs. Has limited alignment to the comprehensive school reform program and the selected models and includes unclear timelines, if any. Has little or no alignment with California content standards or is tied directly to what teachers do in the classroom. Has little or no high quality, long-term, in-depth and continuous teacher and staff, professional development. Allocates minimal time for educators to reflect, analyze, and refine their professional practices. Little evidence of administrative participation, support, and follow-up. Does not focus on building site capacity to sustain reform. Provides for limited learning opportunities <i>including, but not limited to, coaching; analysis of portfolios; examination of student work; and membership in peer support groups.*</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully includes family and community members as active participants and decision makers who receive professional development to help them become integral educational partners. <p>(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for some family and community members as participants and decision makers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not include family and community members as active participants and decision makers.
---	---	---

COMPONENT 4: MEASURABLE GOALS AND BENCHMARKS

(10 maximum points)

As part of its comprehensive school reform plan, each school must have measurable goals and benchmarks toward these goals to serve two purposes: 1) as an ongoing monitoring mechanism for school staff, and 2) as the basis for the yearly CSRD program evaluation.

LEAs must submit continuation proposals for years two and three for each CSRD school. Proposals must include data that show progress toward meeting the previous year's goals and benchmarks that are described in the LEA and school evaluation designs and that are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program. Goals and benchmarks must address student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and model implementation. The Department will monitor individual school progress through its statewide evaluation and make annual determinations as to whether schools qualify to receive continuation grants for years two and three.

These measurable goals and benchmarks must be directly related to the comprehensive needs assessment and must address the following areas:

- 1) **student achievement** of California standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, including the use of STAR and other measures contained in the provisions of California's Public School Performance Accountability Program.
- 2) **other indicators of school performance** *in such areas as attendance, discipline referrals, grade promotions, grade retention,, suspensions, expulsions, course taking patterns, graduation and college entrance rates, and parent involvement* specifying the desired success rates for the selected indicators such as an increase in school attendance to 98% or a decrease in grade retention to a 1% rate.
- 3) **implementation of the CSRD reform model** *in such areas as stakeholder support, parent participation, continuous professional development, monitoring of progress and fidelity in implementing the CSRD model selected..**

COMPONENT 4: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks

MOST RIGOROUS (10 – 8 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (7 – 4 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (3 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of measurable goals and benchmarks includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly delineated measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement of California content standards, other indicators of school performance, and full implementation of, and fidelity to, the reform model selected by the school. A detailed timeline for attainment of benchmarks. Clearly described multiple measures used to monitor student attainment of California content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics and yearly progress as a result of the model selected. 	<p>Evidence of measurable goals and benchmarks includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally stated measurable goals and benchmarks of student achievement of district California content standards, other indicators of school performance, and implementation of, and fidelity to, the reform model selected. A general timeline for attainment of benchmarks. A general description of multiple measures used to monitor student attainment of California content standards for reading-language arts and mathematics and yearly progress as a result of the model selected. 	<p>Evidence of measurable goals and benchmarks includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear measurable goals and benchmarks of student achievement of district California content standards, other indicators of school performance, and implementation of the reform model selected. An unclear or missing timeline. A limited description of multiple measures used to monitor student attainment.

(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)

COMPONENT 5: SUPPORT WITHIN THE SCHOOL

(5 maximum points)

Describe the support and commitment for a CSRD program from the school staff including teachers, support staff, classified staff and administrators. Explain how staff, administrators and other stakeholders reached agreement on the program goals and benchmarks. Describe how the budget demonstrates staff and administrators' support and involvement. Please remember that the proposed budget for CSRD funds must be in an amount up to \$200 per student enrolled in the school, with a minimum allocation of \$50,000 per school site.

COMPONENT 5: Support within the School

MOST RIGOROUS (5 – 4 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (3 – 2 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (1 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of support within the school includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ample evidence of collaboration in the process for the selection of the model and the development of the plan. • Detailed description of staff and administrator's support and involvement in the CSRD program and time designated to plan and implement. • Full agreement by staff, administration and other stakeholders on common targets, goals with benchmarks. • A budget that reflects allocations to fully support the school reform effort, including salaries, release time, use of professional development resources and days and others areas. 	<p>Evidence of support within the school includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence of collaboration in the process for the selection of the model and the development of the plan. • General description of staff support and involvement in the CSRD program and time designated to plan and implement. • Some agreement by staff and other stakeholders on common targets, goals with benchmarks. • A budget that reflects some allocations to support the school reform effort, including salaries, release time, use of professional development resources and days, and other areas. 	<p>Evidence of support within the school includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evidence of collaboration in the process for the selection of the model and the development of the plan. • Limited description of staff involvement and time designated to plan and implement. • Limited agreement by staff and other stakeholders on common targets, goals with benchmarks. • A budget that reflects limited allocations to support the school reform effort, including salaries, release time, and others areas.

COMPONENT 6: PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

(5 maximum points)

Describe a comprehensive plan for meaningful involvement of parents and the community in the development and implementation of school improvement activities. Provide details on parent participation and engagement activities and strategies that involve the community in CSRD program efforts. In addition, describe efforts designed to help all school staff and administrators become more knowledgeable about families and their communities.

COMPONENT 6: Parental and Community Involvement

MOST RIGOROUS (5 – 4 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (3 – 2 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (1 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of family and community involvement includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A comprehensive and systematic plan to meaningfully involve family and community members in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the CSRD program.• A description detailing how families and community members are viewed as critical members of the school-community, are actively involved in on-going two-way communication between the home and the school, participate in determining school goals, participate in on-going monitoring and evaluation, and are fully empowered in the implementation of the reform process.• A full explanation of family participation and engagement activities and strategies, including parent/teacher compacts, which demonstrate extensive community involvement and shared resources in the CSRD program.• Full participation of school staff in ongoing professional development to improve their knowledge of students' families and communities including family resources.	<p>Evidence of family and community involvement includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A general plan to involve family and community members in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the CSRD program.• A general description of how families and community members are involved, participate and are empowered in the implementation of the reform process.• A general explanation of parent participation and engagement activities and strategies, including parent/teacher compacts, which demonstrate some community involvement and shared resources in the CSRD program.• Some participation of school staff in ongoing professional development to improve their knowledge of students' families and communities including family resources.	<p>Evidence of family and community involvement includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A partial plan to involve family and community members in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the CSRD program.• A limited description of family and community involvement in the implementation of the reform process.• A limited explanation of parent participation and engagement activities and strategies which demonstrates minimal community involvement in the CSRD program.• Limited participation of school staff in some professional development to improve their knowledge of students' families and communities.

COMPONENT 7: EXTERNAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE

(5 maximum points)

Describe the high-quality technical support and assistance that will be provided by the external service provider(s) to support the CSRD program during the three-year program. The external service provider(s) may come from a variety of entities, *including but not limited to, program model developers, Statewide System of School Support, CDE, Regional Educational Laboratories, and universities.* (See CSRD Web page, Attachment II.) Include evidence of formal agreement of technical assistance support *such as, but not limited to, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), contract, or other formally written agreements from the external provider or other external entities.** Include a proposed timeline of activities related to technical support.

COMPONENT 7: External Technical Support and Assistance

MOST RIGOROUS (5 – 4 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (3 – 2 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (1 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of external technical support and assistance plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ample and convincing evidence of high quality technical assistance plan which will include guiding model implementation, monitoring progress from visit to visit, and building capacity of the onsite staff to implement the model. • A detailed timeline noting the frequency and duration of technical assistance visits and the shift from model initiation to a fully empowered site implementation of the model. • Formal agreements of technical assistance which include provisions for non-performance and renegotiations of agreements in MOUs, contracts, or other formally written and signed agreements from the external service provider or other external entities. • Clear linkage of the LEA technical assistance and support to schools as described in Section D, Description of LEA Support. 	<p>Evidence of external technical support and assistance plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence of high quality technical assistance offered which includes guiding model implementation, monitoring progress, and building capacity of the onsite staff to implement the model. • A general timeline noting technical assistance visits and the shift from model initiation to site implementation of the model. • Some agreements of technical assistance such as MOU, contract, or other formally written and signed agreements from the external service provider or other external entities. • Some linkage of the LEA technical assistance and support to schools as noted in Section D, Description of LEA Support. 	<p>Evidence of external technical support and assistance plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no evidence of quality technical assistance to implement the model. • An unclear timeline that lacks details of technical assistance visits. • Limited or unclear evidence of any formal agreements of technical assistance. • Little or unclear linkage of LEA technical assistance and support to schools.

(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)

COMPONENT 8: EVALUATION STRATEGIES

(15 maximum points)

Each school participating in CSRD must have a comprehensive program evaluation plan that assesses the school's progress on the goals and benchmarks delineated under Component #4. The plan must include assessment of (a) student achievement, (b) other indicators of school performance, and (c) CSRD model implementation. Describe in this section how the school and LEA will collaborate to develop and implement such a plan.

Link the measurable goals, benchmarks, and multiple measures from Component 4 to the evaluation plan. Schools participating in CSRD must agree to participate in the statewide CSRD program evaluation conducted by the California Department of Education. The Department will monitor individual school progress toward meeting previous year's goals and benchmarks that are contained in the school evaluation. LEAs must submit continuation proposals for years two and three for each CSRD school. Proposals must include data that show progress toward meeting the previous year's goals and benchmarks that are described in the LEA and school evaluation designs and that are aligned with California's Public School Performance Accountability Program. Goals and benchmarks must address student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and model implementation.

COMPONENT 8: Evaluation Strategies

MOST RIGOROUS (15 – 11 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (10 – 4 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (3 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of evaluation strategies includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A comprehensive and fully detailed plan for evaluating impact on student achievement, impact on other indicators of school performance, and overall model implementation.• A fully detailed description of how the school and LEA will collaborate on the development and implementation of a program evaluation plan.• Clearly defined linkage of the measurable goals and benchmarks in Component #4 to the school's program evaluation plan.	<p>Evidence of evaluation strategies includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A general plan for the program evaluation regarding student achievement, other indicators of school performance, and model implementation.• A general description of the how the school and LEA will collaborate on the development and implementation of a program evaluation plan.• Some linkages of the measurable goals and benchmarks in Component #4 to the school's evaluation plan.	<p>Evidence of evaluation strategies includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A limited plan for the program evaluation.• A limited description of school and LEA collaboration.• Few or no linkages of the measurable goals and benchmarks to the school's evaluation plan.

COMPONENT 9: COORDINATION OF SERVICES AND LEVERAGING OF RESOURCES

(5 maximum points)

Explain how services and resources will be coordinated to support and sustain the program. Describe how CSRD funds will be used to leverage a variety of resources from other sources and reform initiatives such as local, state, federal, private, etc. in order to expand and sustain school reform. Explain how these efforts will be sustained after federal funds are no longer available. Use Form 5 (Individual School Budget) to provide a line-item budget for the CSRD program. Include other funding sources that will be used to support and sustain the program.

COMPONENT 9: Coordination of Services and Leveraging of Resources

MOST RIGOROUS (5 – 4 points)	SOMEWHAT RIGOROUS (3 – 2 points)	NOT RIGOROUS (1 – 0 points)
<p>Evidence of coordination of services and leveraging of resources includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed description of how CSRD funded services will be coordinated and aligned with other existing services (local, state, private) to the school. • A detailed explanation of how CSRD funds will leverage a variety of existing resources from funding sources and other reform initiatives and coordinate services in order to expand and sustain school wide reform. The resources <i>may include, but are not limited to, local, state and federal agencies, higher institutions of education, social agencies, law enforcement, local government, business and industry, technology sources, visual and performing arts agencies, training and professional development agencies/resources and private foundations.*</i> • A detailed description of the alignment of expenditures that addresses coordination and compliance issues. Expenditures that demonstrate leveraged support for CSRD goals and fully complies with all applicable provisions of federal, state, and local rules, regulations, and policies relating to the administration, use and accounting for public school funds. • A complete explanation of how these efforts will be sustained after federal funds are no longer available. <p>(* Italicized lists are suggested examples only.)</p>	<p>Evidence of coordination of services and leveraging of resources includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general description of how CSRD funded services will be coordinated with other existing services. • A general application that describes how CSRD funds will be used to leverage resources in order to expand and sustain schoolwide reform which <i>may include, local, state, and federal agencies, higher educational institutions, social agencies, law enforcement, local government, business and industry, technology sources, visual and performing arts agencies, and private foundations.*</i> • A general description of alignment of expenditures that addresses coordination and compliance issues. Expenditures that demonstrate leveraging support for CSRD goals and generally complies with applicable provisions of federal, state, and local rules, regulations, and policies. • A general explanation of how these efforts will sustain the program after federal funds are no longer available. 	<p>Evidence of coordination of services and leveraging of resources includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unclear description of coordination of CSRD funded services with existing services. • A partial application that describes how CSRD funds will be used to leverage existing resources and coordinate services to support the reform process. • A limited or unclear description of expenditures. • An unclear explanation of the continuation of the program after funds are not available.

